

### **Remarks**

Applicants thank the Examiner for his careful consideration of the application.

Claims 1 – 3 and 5 - 22 are pending in the application.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112**

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, 21 and 22 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants' representative spoke with the Examiner on 06/09/2008 and the Examiner agreed to reconsider these rejections in view of Applicants' representatives' description of the scope of the claimed subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 3 and 5 – 14 under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicants' respectfully traverse these rejections. In reference to paragraphs 38, 39, and 41, Applicants describe information that may be incorporated into a print job. The Examiner asserts that the claims are not enabled, however, assuming the Examiner agrees that the various tag reading technologies recited by Applicants are well known, then Applicants believe these paragraphs adequately enable the claims.

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102**

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 5, 8, 11 – 16, and 18 – 22 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by Shahindoust (US Publication No. 2004/0190038 A1) ("Shahindoust"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

In claim 1, Applicants recite a method for completing a print job. The method includes delivering at least one print job to a printing device, bringing a tag containing information to be incorporated into the print job into close proximity to the printing device so that the device receives the information from the tag, and incorporating the information received from the tag into the print job.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 1 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. Shahindoust appears to disclose a tag containing either user information or billing information. The Examiner has not shown that information such as, for example, e-mail addresses (including a billing e-mail address), fax numbers, personal printing preferences, or related print jobs are used to complete a print job. Applicants describe that all of the preceding may be incorporated into a print job to complete the print job. For the foregoing reasons claim 1 should be allowed over Shahindoust.

The Examiner should allow claims 2 – 8, 11, and 12 if claim 1 is allowed as claims 2 – 8, 11, and 12 depend from claim 1.

In claim 15, Applicants recite a method for transferring documents from one location to another. The method includes sending at least one document to be transferred to the queue of a device having document transmission capabilities, bringing an electronic tag containing information in close proximity to a tag reader operably connected to the device having document transmission capabilities so that the tag may be read and information is received by the device. Finally, using the information received from the tag to transmit the document.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 15 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, using information received from a tag to transmit a document. The passages cited by the Examiner appear to disclose using a Bluetooth enabled smart card to authenticate a user, but the passage in question does not appear to disclose using information on the Bluetooth smart cards to transmit a document. For the foregoing reasons, claim 15 should be allowed over Shahindoust.

The Examiner should allow claim 16 if claim 15 is allowed as claim 16 depends from claim 15.

In claim 18, Applicants recite a system for generating an advertisement. The system includes a tag encoded with advertising information, a tag reading device

for reading the tag and receiving the advertising information therefrom, and an output device operably connected to the tag reading device, wherein the output device generates the advertisement.

The Examiner should withdraw the rejection to claim 18 over Shahindoust as the Examiner has not shown that Shahindoust discloses, for example, a tag encoded with advertising information or a tag reading device that receives the advertising information therefrom. As previously noted, the passages cited by the Examiner appear to merely disclose using a Bluetooth card for authentication purposes. The Examiner has not identified any portion of the application that appears to disclose using information stored on the Bluetooth card in a print job. Further, the Examiner has not pointed to any passage in Shahindoust that discloses using advertising information from a tag to produce an advertisement.

The Examiner should allow claims 19 – 22 if claim 18 is allowed as claims 19 – 22 depend from claim 18.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, 9, 10 and 17 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahindoust in view of Yajima et al. (US Publication No. 2002/0016833 A1) (“Yajima”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 depend from claim 1. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example, incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. The Examiner has not identified this limitation in Yajima either. Therefore, claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

The Examiner rejected claims 13 and 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shahindoust in view of Harrison et al. (US Patent No. 6,249,226) (“Harrison”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 1. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example,

incorporating information received from a tag into a print job. The Examiner has not identified this limitation in Harrison either. Therefore, claims 13 and 14 should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed.

The Examiner has rejected claim 17 as obvious over Shahindoust. Claim 17 depends from claim 15. As Applicants have previously argued, the Examiner has not established that Shahindoust discloses, for example, using information received from a tag to transmit a document. Therefore, claim 17 should be allowed if claim 15 is allowed as claim 17 depends from claim 15.

### **Conclusion**

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

A telephone interview is respectfully requested at the number listed below prior to any further Office Action, i.e., if the Examiner has any remaining questions or issues to address after this paper. The undersigned will be happy to discuss any further Examiner-proposed amendments as may be appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

/Joseph M. Young, Reg. No. 45248/

---

Joseph M. Young  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 45,248  
Telephone (503) 685-4229  
June 13, 2008

JMY/rjh